

REMARKS

Interview Summary

On June 4, 2009, a telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner Cehic and Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626. The Examiner is kindly thanked for granting this interview. During the interview, the present amendment was discussed, and it was agreed that the amendment would overcome the currently cited prior art. It was also agreed that the amendment would be filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

Substantive Remarks

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the use of the phrase “no separate clock signals”. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to remove this element. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9, 10, 12-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,068,686 in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification and MPEG-2 Transmission.

Claims 1-18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent 7,177,329 in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification and MPEG-2 Transmission.

Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of copending Application No. 10/726,350 in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification and MPEG-2 Transmission.

A properly executed terminal disclaimer accompanies this response. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the three nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooshima et al. (U.S. 2002/0071055) (as evidenced by “MPEG-2 Transmission”) in view of Universal Serial Bus Specification and MPEG-2 Transmission., and Greis et al. (U.S. 2004/0081151).

The Examiner cites Ooshima’s USB bus as evidence of a packet based display interface arranged to connect a video source directly to a video display device. The Examiner then uses the USB Specification’s teaching of virtual USB pipes to teach the unidirectional main link and bidirectional auxiliary channel in claims 1, 7, and 13. Applicant respectfully believes that the present invention is differentiable from a USB bus because the prior art does not have a physically separate unidirectional main link and bidirectional auxiliary channel.

The present invention has (at least) two physically separate data transmission lines. Referring to FIG. 17 of the present invention (reproduced below), it can be seen that the main link lines (with pair 1, 2 being a first main link line, pair 4, 5 being a second main link line, and pair 7, 8 being a third main link line) are physically separate from the auxiliary channel line (pair 10,11). These are not virtual “pipes”, they are actual “pipes.” USB, on the other hand, has a single data “line” pair (while USB wires have a positive and negative data line these data lines operate in conjunction to achieve a single bidirectional link, therefore it would be impossible to call one of these data lines a main link and one an auxiliary channel). The claims have been amended to make this distinction more clear. Specifically, the prior art does not teach or suggest a bi-directional auxiliary channel line physically separate from a unidirectional main link line as stated in the amended claims.

Connector Shell		
	1	Main Link Ch0+
	2	Main Link Ch0-
	3	Ground
	4	Main Link Ch1+
	5	Main Link Ch1-
	6	Ground
1700	7	Main Link Ch2+
	8	Main Link Ch2-
	9	Ground
	10	Aux.Ch.+
	11	Aux.Ch.-
	12	Ground
	13	+12V Power
Connector Shell		

Fig. 17

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For example, claim 3 indicates that a stream is one of a number of streams each having an associated adjustable data stream link rate that is independent of a native stream rate. For at least these reasons, claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18

are not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art and/or the official notice outlined in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/
Marc S. Hanish
Registration No. 42,626

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
(408) 255-8001